DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 286 JC 880 591

AUTHOR	Renkiewicz, Nancy; And Others
TITLE	Indicators and Measures of Successful Community Colleges. A Report to the 59th Annual CACC Convention, November 1988.
INSTITUTION	California Association of Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Nov 88
NOTE	39p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Community College Issues Subscriptions, California Association of Community Colleges, 2017 "O" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Educational Quality; *Evaluation Criteria; Instructional Effectiveness; *Outcomes of Education; Questionnaires; *School Effectiveness; Student Attitudes; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted by the California Association of Community Colleges (CACC) to determine the perceptions of several constituency groups concerning the relative success of California's community colleges. The study sought to identify indicators of institutional success and appropriate measures for each indicator. Surveys conducted at the 1987 CACC Convention and the April 1988 CACC Research Conference solicited information from a total of 34 students, 95 trustees, 179 faculty members, 163 college administrators, and 91 district administrators. Study findings included the following: (1) faculty effectiveness, positive faculty/student relationships, and student satisfaction with the quality of instruction were considered the most important indicators of quality; (2) process measures were considered more important than outcomes measures; (3) all groups rated faculty effectiveness as the most important indicator in both surveys, except the 1988 student respondents who rated student satisfaction with services as most important; and (4) measures for faculty effectiveness were identified as course retention rates, student achievement of stated course objectives, and student perceptions of faculty effectiveness. The survey instruments are included. (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED3012286

INDICATORS AND MEASURES OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Report to the 59th Annual CACC Convention

November, 1988

California Association of Community Colleges
Commission on Research

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Principal Authors

Nancy Renkiewicz
Merilee Lewis
Bill Hamre

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 880 591

THE CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES is an institution-based, nonprofit, voluntary state association organized for the purposes of representing the interests of the community and junior colleges of California. The Association supports California's local community colleges in the pursuit of their goals and promotes community college education by providing leadership and service. It fulfills its mission by: (a) developing policy recommendations, supported by appropriate research, on issues of importance to community colleges at the local, state, and national levels, (b) advocating to governmental bodies the policies determined to be in the best interests of community college education, (c) assisting member institutions in developing and promoting solutions to problems of local concern, (d) facilitating the efforts of institutions, segments, organizations and agencies to work and speak cooperatively on behalf of California community colleges, (e) informing members of the community college community and the general public of current issues and research in community college education, (f) coordinating and regulating intercollegiate athletics on behalf of California's Community Colleges, and (g) developing human and financial resources to aid the member institutions and the Association to enhance community college education.

Copyright under International, Pan American, and Universal Copyright Conventions. All rights reserved. No part of this volume may be reproduced in any form—except for brief quotation (not to exceed 100 words) in a review or professional work—without permission in writing from the publisher.

Manufactured in the United States of America

INDICATORS AND MEASURES OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

CACC COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

Principal Authors:
Nancy Renkiewicz
Bill Hamre
Merrilee Lewis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	METHOD	1
III.	INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVENESS	2
IV.	MEASURES FOR TOP TEN INDICATORS	5
V.	POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
VI.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	7
	TABLE I	9
	TABLE II	10
	TABLE III	12
	TABLE IV	13
	TABLE V	14
	TABLE VI	15
	TABLE VII	16
	TABLE VIII	17
	TABLE IX	18
	TABLE X	19
	APPENDIX A	21
	APPENDIX B	26
	APPENDIX C	27

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the help of the members of the Research Commission in formulating the study design and assisting with the tabulation of data. Special help in selecting indicators and measures and editing was provided by Richard Rasor, George Boggs, Peter Hirsch, Cindy Smith and Marty Dunlap. Editing and Word Processing thanks to Barbara Hayslip and Helen Rodolari.

I. INTRODUCTION

A growing interest in measuring success in higher education has emerged in the last few years. This interest, largely fueled by scarce resources and the need to make choices between funding alternatives, has resulted in many proposed plans for measuring community college outcomes and judging their success.

A definition of a "successful" community college is somewhat dependent on the perception of the person judging the success. Success from the legislative viewpoint might be measured in terms of number of students receiving the AA degree and the cost for each student. Success to a university administrator may be the number and quality of transfer students received from the college. Success to the student may be measured in terms of whether he/she could take the two courses needed for a promotional opportunity at work. Therefore, the definition of success is somewhat dependent on the set of experiences and framework used to judge that success. It is a highly subjective rating dependent on needs and experiences.

Even if constituencies could agree on the criteria for success, there are so many variables involved that it is difficult to isolate what makes one college successful as compared to another. However, people do make comparisons between colleges and have perceived differences related to quality. Many times funding and/or program decisions are influenced by these perceptions.

In the past, the main technique used to distinguish successful colleges has been a "panel of experts" approach. (These studies pick successes and then try to determine what they have in common.) This technique uses experts to rate and collectively determine successful colleges. Critics of this approach cite the usually small number of experts and failure to predetermine a broad-based group of indicators of success as the major shortcomings of this method.

To address some of these concerns, the Research Commission of the California Association of Community Colleges (CACC) designed a study to query a variety of constituency groups regarding their perceptions of community college success. The Commission wanted to approach the issue of defining college effectiveness in a more quantitative way. Therefore, it was proposed that CACC conference attendees composed of students, faculty, administrators and trustees be surveyed to determine their perception of the relative importance of a large list of potential indicators of college effectiveness.

II. METHOD

To determine a comprehensive list of indicators, the Commission members all contributed indicators which they thought were important during a Commission meeting in Spring, 1987. That list was compiled and sent to each Commission member for further comment and refinement. The final list was discussed at length at a second Commission meeting. The major discussion centered on whether to limit the list of indicators to include only outcome indicators such as: "Number of Students Receiving Degrees," "Vocational Program Completion Rate," or to also include process indicators such as: "Financial Stability" and "Positive Reaction of Staff to Students." The Commission decided to include both outcome and process indicators.

As the list of indicators was developed, the study team realized that a variety of measures could be used to evaluate how a college was performing on any given indicator. The measures selected for each indicator could affect the ranking of the indicator. Therefore, the study was designed to: 1) identify indicators and 2) identify appropriate measures for each indicator. Since the task of selecting appropriate measures was more complex than the identification of indicators and required some knowledge of research methods, the study team decided to test and refine this part of the study at the California Association of Community Colleges Research Conference in April, 1988.

The indicator study was conducted at the 1987 CACC Convention during two general sessions. The first round was distributed at the opening session, and the second round at a Saturday luncheon. In the first round, convention participants were given a survey form (Appendix A) which asked them to rank, on a four-point Likert-type scale, the importance of 33 "Indicators of Successful Community Colleges." Respondent demographic information was also collected which included identification of respondent's constituency group, age and location, type and size of district.

The results of this first survey were tabulated during the conference and reported at the Saturday general session. The data were analyzed by each group: students; faculty; college administrators; district administrators; and trustees. The indicators were ranked according to overall mean score.

The top 19 indicators were selected for the Round Two survey. Nineteen indicators were chosen because there was a substantial difference in the mean score between the 19th and 20th ranked indicator. In the second round, the respondents were asked to rank order the indicators from 1-10 with number one as the most important indicator. Round Two was conducted after the results were summarized from the first round (Appendix B).

The second part of the study was conducted at the Research Conference in April. One general session was devoted to selecting measures for the top ten indicators. Approximately 60 conference participants were provided with the ten indicators and examples of measures for each indicator. To select the measure, a discussion group was formed for each indicator, and participants self-selected into one of the groups. Most groups had at least six participants. Each group discussed which measures were appropriate for its indicator. The group developed a list of measures it felt were suitable. From these lists a survey was developed. The survey was distributed to all conference participants, asking them to rank the top four measures for each of the ten indicators. (Appendix C)

III. INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVENESS

Tables I through X contain the results of the survey conducted at the 1987/88 CACC Convention. The following questions and answers highlight the major findings:

1. **Who responded to the questionnaires on indicators?**

Respondents to Round One and Round Two were quite similar. The smallest group represented was Students (5-7%), followed by Trustees (15-19%), Faculty (30-33%) and Administrators (44-47%). (See Table I)

2. **What indicators received the highest rankings from conference participants?**

The top three indicators in both Round One and Two of the survey all relate to faculty/student interaction. The highest mean ranking was "Faculty Effectiveness" (3.82), followed by "Positive Faculty/Student Relationships" (3.68) and "Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction." Other indicators ranked in top five of Round One or Two are: "Financial Stability," "Effectiveness of Administrative Staff" and "Positive Reaction of Staff to Students." All indicators were considered to be at least "Somewhat Important." There was a spread of only .97 on a 4.0 scale between the highest indicator and the lowest. (See Tables II and III)

3. **Were outcome measures and process measures selected equally?**

Process measures ranked higher than outcome measures. Only three outcome measures appeared in the top 19 in Round One: "Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction;" "Student Satisfaction with Services;" and "Retention of Students." (See Table II)

4. **How consistent were the rankings between the respondent groups?**

All groups, except Students, rated "Faculty Effectiveness" as the most important indicator. There was much more consensus on the most important indicator than there was on the least important. This is true throughout the study. As was expected, as the list of indicators was narrowed from Round One to Round Two, the groups showed more consensus in their rankings. During Round Two, students also ranked "Faculty Effectiveness" as the most important indicator. This greater consistency may be due to the fact that respondents were given a list of Round One rankings, and these rankings were reviewed before Round Two surveys were completed.

5. **How consistent were the rankings between Round One and Round Two?**

If respondents in Round Two had been influenced solely by Round One results, then Round Two rankings should have stayed the same. This did not occur. The largest shifts occurred in the following indicators: #5, "Effectiveness of Administrative Staff," had a Round One rank of 9 and a Round Two rank of 5; "Effectiveness of Planning" went from a rank of 16 up to 11; "Ongoing Program Development" went from a rank of 10 down to 14; "Effectiveness of District Governing Board" went from a rank of 19 up to 15; "Ability to Attract New Students" went from a rank of 12 down to 17; and "Sufficient Equipment to Support College Programs" from a rank of 14 down to 18. (See Tables IV and V)

6. **Did each respondent group rank indicators the same from Round One to Round Two?**

The respondents were quite consistent in their rankings from Round One to Round Two. In selecting the top ten indicators, District Administrators and Students selected the same 9 indicators in both Round One and Two; College Administrators chose the same eight; and Faculty and Trustees selected the same seven indicators in Round One and Two.

7. **How did the respondent groups differ in their ranking of the indicators?**

Some indicators were more important to certain respondents' groups than others. A few observations include:

1) "Effectiveness of Administrative Staff" was ranked fifth by College/District Administrators and Trustees, but Faculty ranked this indicator eighth, and Students fourteenth.

2) "Community Perception of College" was ranked much higher by College/District Administrators and Trustees than by Students and Faculty.

3) "Adequate Facilities" are ranked higher by Students and Faculty.

4) "Effectiveness of Governing Board" was in the top ten only for District Administrators and Trustees, and was ranked last by Faculty.

5) Only Students ranked "Ability to Attract Students" in top nineteen.

6) Trustees were the only group who did not rank "Student Satisfaction with Services" in the top ten.

7) "Effectiveness of Articulation" is ranked lowest by three of the five groups.

8) "Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction" appears to be of lower value to Trustees than with any other respondent group.

9) "Financial Stability" ranged from a low percentage of 52.6% for students to a high of 90.6% for Trustees.

(See Table VI and VII)

10) "Effectiveness of Administration" similarly ranged from a low of 47.4% for students to a high of 75% for District Administrators.

11) "Ongoing Program Development" was chosen by 63% of the Students, but only 33% of the College Administrators.

12) Only one-half or less of students and faculty felt that "Community Perception of College" should be ranked in top ten, whereas close to 70% of the Administrators ranked this indicator in top ten.

8. **Do respondents from Northern and Southern California agree on the top ten indicators?**

The North and South agree on the top four indicators. The other rankings appear closely aligned with a few exceptions.

"Student Satisfaction with Services" appears to be relatively more important to Southern colleges and "Facilities" more important to the North. "Community Perception of the College" appeared in top ten of the North, but not the South. "Effectiveness of District Governing Board" appears in the South list, but not in the North. (See Table VIII)

9. **Do respondents' ages affect their ranking of the top indicators?**

Age was used to categorize responses to each of the top nineteen indicators. Little variation occurred in the top four indicators. Much variation occurred in the following:

Valued More Highly by Those Under 50	Valued More Highly by Those Over 50
Student Satisfaction with Services	Adequate Facilities to Support Progress
Effectiveness of Planning	Positive Management/Certificated and Classified Relationships
Ongoing Program Development	Effectiveness of District Governing Board
Ability to Attract New Students	Effectiveness of Administrative Staff

(See Table IX)

10. **Do employees from single campuses and multi-campuses respond in the same way?**

Another respondent group considered in the analysis was single campus employees as compared to multi-campus employees. Very few differences occur. Those exceptions are as shown below:

Valued More Highly by Single Campus	Valued More Highly by Multi-campus
Student Retention	Positive Reaction of Staff to Students
Comprehensiveness of Curriculum	Positive Management Certificated and Classified Relationships
	Effectiveness of District Governing Board
	Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Post-Secondary Institutions

(See Table X)

IV. MEASURES FOR TOP TEN INDICATORS

The second part of the study conducted at the Asilomar Research Conference produced a set of measures for each of the ten indicators. The following is a list of indicators and their measures:

#1 -- FACULTY EFFECTIVENESS

A. Retention rates from 1st census to 2nd census to end of term.

B. Degree to which students meet stated course objectives.

C. Student perceptions of faculty effectiveness.

#2 -- STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

A. Currently enrolled students' perception of instructors from required, standardized evaluation form.

B. Students' self-reports upon exiting a course.

C. Students' self-reports gathered after leaving (with a time interval, e.g.: one semester later).

#3 -- POSITIVE FACULTY/STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

A. Students' perceptions of faculty as positive role models.

B. Did student feel recognized as an individual in this class?

C. Does instructor give adequate feedback regarding student progress?

#4 -- FINANCIAL VIABILITY*

A. Proportion of expenditures used from reserves for college operation.

B. Percent of general reserves to annual budget.

C. Expenditures per unit of workload.

D. Extent of financial planning.

#5 -- EFFECTIVENESS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

A. Ability to motivate college community.

B. Staff morale.

C. Evidence of key decisions being linked to planning process.

D. The extent faculty/staff are involved in decision-making process.

#6 -- STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES (what a college provides outside classroom)

A. Satisfaction survey while in attendance (a student at the college).

B. Satisfaction survey after leaving (after separation from college).

C. Satisfaction survey at time of service delivery.

D. Student interviews assessing their experience.

*All measures should be assessed over time (5 years).

#7 -- POSITIVE REACTION OF STAFF TO STUDENTS

A. Perceptions of students assessing helpfulness of college staff.

B. Staff satisfaction with job environment.

C. Frequency with which students make use of faculty office hours.

D. Instructors' attitudes of student learning.

#8 -- COMMUNITY PERCEPTION OF THE COLLEGE

A. Solicited community attitudes using various methods (written surveys, telephone contacts, focused interviews) of various groups such as employers, high school counselors, under-represented populations. Formal needs assessment including perceived attitudes is the most comprehensive method.

B. Percent of local high school graduates attending college.

C. Participation rate of population of the District in college activities.

D. Number of requests for service from business, industry and other agencies.

#9 -- ADEQUATE FACILITIES TO SUPPORT COLLEGE PROGRAMS

A. Number of hours of room availability compared to number of hours used.

B. Flexibility, adaptability of floor space to meet changing needs.

C. Adequacy of equipment to meet current instructional needs.

#10 -- RETENTION OF STUDENTS

A. Total units completed, divided by total units attempted at first census (unit earned rate).

B. Re-enrollment rates (over time).

(Appendix C)

V. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Measuring institutional effectiveness is a complex task, and defining effectiveness is one of the first steps to be addressed in accomplishing that task. The indicator and measures list developed in this study may be used as a resource in a study of institutional effectiveness. However, users should consider the following:

1. An indicator is defined as something "that points out, gives an indication of, or expresses briefly or generally." Indicators are not meant to be precise measurements. They may show a tendency or a direction when a number of them are studied together. Care should, therefore, be taken to assemble and look at indicators in a general sense and not use them specifically to measure success.

2. Although there is consistency among the different constituency groups in ranking the top four indicators, variations occur between groups for indicators below the top four. Perhaps respondents have well-defined ideas regarding what the most important indicators are, because these issues have been discussed before. Conversely, they may be less concerned about precisely rating indicators of lesser importance. Consistency improved somewhat as the list was narrowed from nineteen to ten indicators. However, there were still some very different

perceptions about the importance of indicators. The differing perceptions of what constitutes success would have to be addressed before any study results would be acceptable to all groups. It might be of some benefit to assemble a representative group and try to come to a consensus regarding some of the discrepancies.

3. This study involved only internal constituency groups, those persons directly involved in the process of community college education. Other groups of individuals outside the actual process have a great deal of influence on the process. It would be of benefit to query legislators, Board of Governor members and other groups who have direct impact and interest in the success of community colleges to determine what indicators would be important to them.

4. While this study made progress in defining the indicators and measures, which were perceived to be appropriate, it stopped short in determining procedures to be used to obtain the information. In order for colleges to assess their effectiveness using the proposed indicators and measures, procedures might be assembled from the existing literature or new materials created as appropriate.

5. The initial list of indicators included both process and outcome indicators. The researchers were somewhat surprised when certain outcome indicators failed to be selected in the top ten indicators. One reason for this may be that the professionals in the field realize that the procedures used to measure these outcomes can be very complex. Community college personnel may be concerned that a simplistic approach would provide distorted information which might be harmful to the college. For example, the issue of community college completers is a complex one. Who is a completer? A student who receives a degree or certificate? A student who learns a skill and takes a job? A student who earns enough units to transfer? As a follow-up, it would be beneficial to ask some representatives from the conference to indicate their perceptions about why these indicators were not chosen as the most important.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. The final ten indicators and their measures along with methods used to collect the information should be pilot tested in a number of colleges. The results of these pilot tests would determine how beneficial these indicators were to the college, how easy they were to measure and what benefit the college derived by participating in the process.

2. The technique of doing small research projects at annual conferences should be explored further. The researchers participating in the study felt that the quick turnaround, the large captive audience and the small cost were definite advantages which researchers don't often encounter. Some controls are lacking as to population, but these seem to be outweighed by the advantages. These "mini-research" projects could substantially increase the body of knowledge and should be encouraged.

3. The indicators and measures should further be refined after testing and input from others external to the colleges, and a larger sample of students should be included.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FOR ROUND 1 AND ROUND 2

	Round 1	%	Round 2	%
Student	15	5	19	7
Faculty	95	33	84	30
College Administrator	83	29	80	29
District Administrator	51	18	40	15
Trustees	42	15	53	19
TOTAL	286	100%	276	100%

TABLE II

ROUND ONE: MEAN AND RANK OF INDICATOR

(Highest Possible Mean = 4.0)

Indicator	Mean	Rank Order
Faculty Effectiveness	3.82	1
Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	3.68	2
Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction	3.62	3
Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	3.61	4
Financial Stability	3.54	5
Student Satisfaction with Services	3.51	6
Community Perception of the College	3.48	7
Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	3.45	8
Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	3.44	9.5
Ongoing Program Development	3.44	9.5
Retention of Students	3.42	11
Ability to Attract New Students	3.41	12
Positive Management/Certificated and Classified Relationships	3.40	13
Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Programs	3.36	14
Comprehensiveness of the Curriculum	3.34	15.5
Effectiveness of Planning	3.34	15.5
Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/ Administrative/Classified Staff	3.32	17
Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	3.30	18
Effectiveness of the District Governing Board	3.28	19
Overall Student Completion Rate	3.18	20
Effectiveness of Classified Staff	3.17	21
Safety within the College Environment	3.08	22

Table II

Indicator	Mean	Rank Order
Performance of Community College Students who Transfer to a 4-year College or University	3.06	23.5
Effectiveness of Learning Resource Programs	3.06	23.5
Enrollment Stability	3.04	25.5
Job Placement in Major Field of Study	3.04	25.5
Student Participation Rate	3.01	27
Vocational Program Completion Rate	3.00	28
Effectiveness of Research and Evaluation Activities	2.97	29
Adequate Participation of All Represented Groups in the Community	2.95	30
Evidence of Articulation Agreements with Secondary Schools	2.89	31
Attractive Physical Environment	2.86	32
General Community Participation in College Activities	2.85	33

TABLE III

ROUND 1

HIGHEST AND LOWEST RANKED INDICATOR FOR EACH RESPONDENT GROUP

Respondent Group	Highest Ranked Indicator	Lowest Ranked Indicator
Student	Student Satisfaction with Services (3.87)	General Community Participation in College Activities (2.67)
Faculty	Faculty Effectiveness (3.85)	Attractive Physical Environment (2.81)
College Administrator	Faculty Effectiveness (3.84)	Evidence of Articulation Agreements with Other Post-secondary Schools (2.90)
District Administrator	Faculty Effectiveness (3.84)	General Community Participation; Adequate Participation of All Represented Groups in the Community (2.80)
Trustees	Faculty Effectiveness (3.88)	Attractive Physical Environment (2.71)
Overall	Faculty Effectiveness (3.82)	General Community Participation in College Activities (2.85)

TABLE IV

ROUND 2

HIGHEST AND LOWEST RANKED INDICATOR FOR EACH RESPONDENT GROUP

Respondent Group	Highest Ranked Indicator	Lowest Ranked Indicator
Student	Faculty Effectiveness	Continuing Staff Development
Faculty	Faculty Effectiveness	Effective District Governing Board
College Administrator	Faculty Effectiveness	Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Schools
District Administrator	Faculty Effectiveness	Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Schools
Trustees	Faculty Effectiveness	Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Schools
Overall	Faculty Effectiveness	Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Schools

TABLE V

OVERALL RANKING OF TOP NINETEEN INDICATORS

ROUND 1 and ROUND 2

INDICATORS	Round One Overall Rank	Round Two Overall Rank
1. Faculty Effectiveness	1	1
2. Student Satisfaction w/Quality of Instruction	3	2
3. Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	2	3
4. Financial Stability	5	4
5. Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	9	5
6. Student Satisfaction with Services	6	6
7. Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	4	7
8. Community Perception of the College	7	8
9 Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	8	9
10. Student Retention	11	10
11. Effectiveness of Planning	16	11
12. Comprehensiveness of Curriculum	15	12
13. Positive Management/Certificated & Classified Relationships	13	13
14. Ongoing Program Development	10	14
15. Effectiveness of District Governing Board	19	15
16. Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/ Administrative/Classified Staff	17	16
17. Ability to Attract New Students	12	17
18. Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Programs	14	18
19. Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	18	19

TABLE VI

RANKING OF THE TOP 19 INDICATORS FOR ROUND 2 BY RESPONDENT CATEGORY

(Top 10 Round One Rankings in Parenthesis)

Indicator	Student N = 19	Faculty N = 84	College N = 80	District N = 40	Trustee N = 53
Faculty Effectiveness	1 (7)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction	2 (8)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (4)	4 (7)
Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	3 (3)	3 (3)	3 (4)	4 (2)	3 (2)
Financial Stability	8 (4)	4 (8)	4	3 (5)	2 (4)
Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	14	8	5 (6)	5 (6)	5 (6)
Student Satisfaction with Services	4 (1)	7 (4)	6 (9)	7 (8)	12
Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	7 (2)	5 (5)	10 (5)	8 (3)	8 (5)
Community Perception of the College	15	15	7 (3)	6 (7)	7
Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	5	6 (7)	12 (10)	15 (9)	9
Student Retention	6 (9)	10	9 (8)	11	11 (10)
Effectiveness of Planning	17	12	8	9	13
Comprehensiveness of Curriculum	12	9	11	13	15 (8)
Positive Management/Certificated & Classified Relationships	18	14	13	14	10
Ongoing Program Development	10 (10)	13 (6)	14	16	14 (9)
Effectiveness of District Governing Board	13 (10)	19	17	10 (10)	6 (3)
Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/Administrative/ Classified Staff	19	11 (10)	16	12	18
Ability to Attract New Students	9 (10)	17	15 (7)	17	16
Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Programs	11	16 (9)	18	18	17
Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	16	18	19	19	19

These choices were Student Top Ten Round 1, but did not make final 19 cut:
Student Participation Rate (5)
Overall Student Completion Rate (6)

TABLE VII

PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS BY GROUP CHOOSING INDICATOR IN TOP 10

Indicator	Student N = 19 %	Faculty N = 84 %	College N = 80 %	District N = 40 %	Trustee N = 53 %	Overall N = 314 %
1. Faculty Effectiveness	94.7	94.0	90.0	92.5	94.3	92.4
2. Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction	94.7	88.1	85.0	85.0	64.2	81.5
3. Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	100.0	83.3	68.8	67.5	64.2	73.9
4. Financial Stability	52.6	71.4	83.8	82.5	90.6	79.0
5. Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	47.4	53.6	73.8	75.0	73.6	65.0
6. Student Satisfaction with Services	63.2	60.7	66.3	65.0	43.4	59.6
7. Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	68.4	58.3	47.5	47.5	41.5	51.6
8. Community Perception of the College	42.1	50.0	67.5	70.0	62.3	58.6
9. Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	73.7	64.3	48.8	37.5	60.4	56.1
10. Student Retention	57.9	45.2	51.2	42.5	43.3	48.7
11. Effectiveness of Planning	26.3	41.7	56.2	40.0	47.2	47.8
12. Comprehensiveness of Curriculum	42.1	44.0	45.0	45.0	32.1	40.4
13. Positive Management/ Certificated and Classified Relationships	5.3	39.3	42.5	40.0	39.6	38.5
14. Ongoing Program Development	63.2	48.8	38.8	32.5	50.9	44.9
15. Effectiveness of District Governing Board	36.8	45.5	25.0	47.5	66.0	33.1
16. Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/Administrative/ Classified Staff	10.5	47.6	33.8	40.0	30.2	36.9
17. Ability to Attract New Students	57.9	32.1	38.8	27.5	30.2	35.4
18. Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Program	36.8	36.9	21.2	27.5	34.0	31.8
19. Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	26.3	17.9	17.5	7.5	13.2	17.2

TABLE VIII

TOP TEN INDICATORS BY NORTH AND SOUTH COLLEGE DISTRICTS

Rank	North (N = 170)	South (N = 120)
1	Faculty Effectiveness	Faculty Effectiveness
2	Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	Positive Faculty/Student Relationships
3	Student Satisfaction w/Quality of Instruction	Student Satisfaction w/Quality of Instruction
4	Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	Effectiveness of Administrative Staff
5	Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	Student Satisfaction with Services
6	Financial Stability	Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs
7	Student Satisfaction with with Services	Financial Stability
8	Community Perception of the College	Effectiveness of Planning
9	Positive Reaction of Staff to Student	Positive Reaction of Staff to Students
10	Effectiveness of Planning	Effectiveness of District Governing Board

TABLE IX

RANKING BY THE AGE CATEGORY OF THE RESPONDENT

Indicator	Under 40	41-50	51-60	Over 61
1. Faculty Effectiveness	1	1	1	1
2. Student Satisfaction w/Quality of Instruction	2	2	3	2
3. Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	3	3	2	3
4. Financial Stability	4	4	4	4
5. Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	7	5	5	5
6. Student Satisfaction with Services	5	6	8	6
7. Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	8	7	6	11
8. Community Perception of the College	10	8	10	8
9. Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	11	11	7	7
10. Student Retention	6	9	9	12
11. Effectiveness of Planning	9	10	13	13
12. Comprehensiveness of Curriculum	12	12	12	18
13. Positive Management/ Certificated & Classified Relationships	15	15	11	9
14. Ongoing Program Development	13	13	16	15
15. Effectiveness of District Governing Board	18	17	14	10
16. Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/Administrative/ Classified Staff	16	14	15	14
17. Ability to Attract New Students	14	15	17	17
18. Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Programs	16	18	18	16
19. Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	19	19	19	19

TABLE X

ROUND 2 RESULTS FOR RESPONDENTS WHO WORKED WITHIN A SINGLE OR MULTI-CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Indicator	Single Campus Rank	Multi-Campus Rank
1. Faculty Effectiveness	1	1
2. Student Satisfaction w/Quality of Instruction	3	3
3. Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	2	2
4. Financial Stability	7	7
5. Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	4	4
6. Student Satisfaction with Services	5	6
7. Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	10	8
8. Community Perception of the College	8	9
9. Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	6	5
10. Student Retention	12	16
11. Effectiveness of Planning	9	10
12. Comprehensiveness of Curriculum	14	17
13. Positive Management/Certificated and Classified Relationships	15	13
14. Ongoing Program Development	18	18
15. Effectiveness of District Governing Board	13	11
16. Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/ Administrative/Classified Staff	11	12
17. Ability to Attract New Students	16	15
18. Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Programs	19	19
19. Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	17	14

APPENDIX A

ROUND ONE - QUESTIONNAIRE

November 15, 1987

Dear Conference Participant:

We would like to ask you to take five minutes to participate in an important research activity to identify indicators of successful community colleges.

The attached questionnaire allows you to express your professional judgment about how important each stated indicator is in determining successful community colleges. Please complete the questionnaire and turn it in at the end of the session.

Your responses will be tabulated and presented at the luncheon on Saturday. At that time, you will also receive a second round questionnaire which will allow you to further refine your choices.

We feel this is a unique opportunity for all constituencies to share their views.

Thanks for your help.

The CACC Research
Commission

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

To allow us to see if different opinions exist within specific groups, please complete the following demographic information:

1. IDENTIFICATION (check one)

- ☐ Student
- ☐ Student Trustee
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ District Aministrator
- ☐ College Administrator
- ☐ Trustee
- ☐ Classified Staff
- ☐ State Agency Employee
- ☐ Other (specify)

2. IF FACULTY, YOUR PRIMARY ROLE (check one)

- ☐ Instructor
- ☐ Counselor
- ☐ Librarian
- ☐ Department/Division Chair
- ☐ Other (specify)

3. IF ADMINISTRATOR, FUNCTION CLOSEST TO YOURS (check one)

- ☐ President/Superintendent
- ☐ Business Services Administration
- ☐ Instructional Administration
- ☐ Student Services Administration
- ☐ Research Administration
- ☐ Grants Administration
- ☐ Personnel Administration
- ☐ Other (specify)_____

4. YOUR AGE (check one)

- ☐ Under 20 years
- ☐ 20 - 25 years
- ☐ 26 - 30 years
- ☐ 31 - 40 years
- ☐ 41 - 50 years
- ☐ 51 - 60 years
- ☐ 61 - 70 years
- ☐ 71 and.above

5. LOCATION OF DISTRICT (check one)

- ☐ Bakersfield and South
- ☐ North of Bakersfield

6. TYPE OF ORGANIZATION (check one)

- ☐ Multi-Campus District
- ☐ Single Campus District

7. IF YOU WORK ON A COLLEGE CAMPUS, FALL, 1987 HEAD-COUNT (check one)

- ☐ 0 - 4,999
- ☐ 5,000 - 9,999
- ☐ 10,000 - 15,999
- ☐ 16,000 - 19,999
- ☐ 20,000 - 29,999
- ☐ 30,000 and over

INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	INDICATOR	How Important is This as an Indicator of Success? Extremely Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important
1.	Community Perception of the College	4	3	2	1
2.	Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	4	3	2	1
3.	Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	4	3	2	1
4.	Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	4	3	2	1
5.	Ability to Attract New Students	4	3	2	1
6.	General Community Participation in College Activities	4	3	2	1
7.	Comprehensiveness of the Curriculum	4	3	2	1
8.	Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	4	3	2	1
9.	Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/Administrative/Classified Staff	4	3	2	1
10.	Performance of Community College Students Who Transfer to a 4-Year College or University	4	3	2	1
11.	Enrollment Stability	4	3	2	1
12.	Job Placement in Major Field of Study	4	3	2	1

INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	INDICATOR	How Important is This as an Indicator of Success? Extremely Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important
13.	Effectiveness of Learning Resource Programs	4	3	2	1
14.	Evidence of Articulation Agreements with Secondary Schools	4	3	2	1
15.	Student Satisfaction with Services	4	3	2	1
16.	Effectiveness of Classified Staff	4	3	2	1
17.	Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	4	3	2	1
18.	Effectiveness of Research and Evaluation Activities	4	3	2	1
19.	Vocational Program Completion Rate	4	3	2	1
20.	Student Participation Rate	4	3	2	1
21.	Effectiveness of the District Governing Board	4	3	2	1
22.	Attractive Physical Environment	4	3	2	1
23.	Financial Stability4	3	2	1	
24.	Ongoing Program Development	4	3	2	1

INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	INDICATOR	How Important is This as an Indicator of Success? Extremely Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important
25.	Retention of Students	4	3	2	1
26.	Overall Student Completion Rate	4	3	2	1
27.	Effectiveness of Planning	4	3	2	1
28.	Positive Management/Certificated and Classified Relationships	4	3	2	1
29.	Adequate Participation of All Represented Groups in the Community	4	3	2	1
30.	Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction	4	3	2	1
31.	Faculty Effectiveness	4	3	2	1
32.	Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Programs	4	3	2	1
33.	Safety Within the College Environment	4	3	2	1
34.	Other (specify) _____	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX B

ROUND TWO - QUESTIONNAIRE

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

In the opening session of the Convention, you were asked to indicate the importance of 33 items in measuring successful community colleges. The results of this survey presented below show the most important indicators along with their average score.

Today, we want you to refine your choices by identifying the 10 most important indicators among the 19 and then by ranking them from 1 - 10. Number one would be your first ranked indicator.

RANK	INDICATOR	AVERAGE SCORE ROUND 1
_____	1. Faculty Effectiveness	3.82
_____	2. Positive Faculty/Student Relationships	3.68
_____	3. Student Satisfaction with Quality of Instruction	3.62
_____	4. Positive Reaction of Staff to Students	3.61
_____	5. Financial Stability	3.54
_____	6. Student Satisfaction with Services	3.51
_____	7. Community Perception of the College	3.48
_____	8. Adequate Facilities to Support College Programs	3.45
_____	9. Effectiveness of Administrative Staff	3.44
_____	10. Ongoing Program Development	3.44
_____	11. Retention of Students	3.42
_____	12. Ability to Attract New Students	3.41
_____	13. Positive Management/Certificated and Classified Relationships	3.40
_____	14. Sufficient Equipment to Support the College Programs	3.36
_____	15. Comprehensiveness of the Curriculum	3.34
_____	16. Effectiveness of Planning	3.34
_____	17. Continuing Staff Development for Faculty/ Administrative/Classified Staff	3.32
_____	18. Effectiveness of Articulation with Other Postsecondary Institutions	3.30
_____	19. Effectiveness of District Governing Board	3.28

APPENDIX C

MEASURES QUESTIONNAIRE

INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROJECT

#1 FACULTY EFFECTIVENESS

_____ Survey of faculty satisfaction.

_____ Ability of faculty to attract students to classes.

_____ Retention rates from 1st census to 2nd census to end of term.

_____ Awards received by faculty.

_____ Classified and administrative staff perception of faculty.

_____ Proportion of hours taught by full-time faculty.

_____ Proportion of Vocational Education faculty who have been employed in the field they are teaching.

_____ Student perceptions of faculty effectiveness.

_____ Results of periodic faculty evaluation by peers, students, and supervising administrator.

_____ Proportion of faculty involved in research in content/curriculum development in their own field.

_____ Degree to which students meet stated course objectives.

#2 STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

_____ Currently enrolled students' perceptions of instructors from required, standardized evaluation form.

_____ Students' self-reports upon exiting a course.

_____ Students' self-reports gathered after leaving (with a time interval, e.g.: one semester later).

_____ Classroom retention (passing grades divided by initial enrollment).

_____ Student re-enrollment with the same instructor.

_____ Consensus results from student focus groups.

#3 POSITIVE FACULTY/STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

_____ Amount of out-of-class time faculty spend with students.

_____ Students' perceptions of faculty as positive role models.

_____ Faculty perception of students.

_____ Reasons why students come to faculty outside of class.

_____ Did student feel recognized as an individual in this class?

_____ Did student look forward to coming to this class?

_____ How often does faculty inquire about student needs (vs. goals)?

_____ Does instructor give adequate feedback regarding student progress?

_____ Is student aware of a grievance system?

_____ When dissatisfied, what did student do (when did they go to, etc.)?

_____ Student retention rates by instructor (with control of as many variables as possible such as course type, hour presented, etc.)?

#4 FINANCIAL VIABILITY*

_____ Amount and number of sources of external funding generated in proportion to general fund.

_____ Proportion of expenditures used from reserves for college operation.

_____ Percent of general reserves to annual budget.

_____ Revenue per unit of workload.

_____ Expenditures per unit of workload.

_____ Diversity of revenue sources.

_____ Positive auditor's report.

_____ Level of college endowment, foundation resources.

_____ Number of profit-making ventures, including lease of land.

_____ Extent of financial planning.

*All measures should be assessed over time (5 years).

#5 EFFECTIVENESS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

_____ Leadership role in the community college system as shown by number of publications, presentations and leadership roles.

_____ Ability to motivate college community.

_____ Fiscal solvency.

_____ Staff morale.

_____ Amount of positive vs. negative press coverage.

_____ Effectiveness in carrying out job descriptions.

_____ Verbal/written presentation skills.

_____ Evidence of key decisions being linked to planning process.

_____ The extent faculty/staff is involved in decision-making process.

#6 STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES (what a college provides outside classroom)

_____ Satisfaction survey while in attendance (a student at the college).

_____ Satisfaction survey after leaving (after separation from college).

_____ Satisfaction survey at time of service delivery.

_____ Interview students about their experience.

_____ Student involvement in services as a percentage of enrollment.

_____ Unsolicited letters to college, paper.

_____ Amount of time it takes to provide a service.

_____ Number of referrals to services by other students.

_____ Increase in number of student-body cards sold at bookstore.

#7 POSITIVE REACTION OF STAFF TO STUDENTS

_____ Number of complaints received about services.

_____ Number of compliments received about services.

_____ Perceptions of students of helpfulness of college staff.

_____ Staff satisfaction with job environment.

_____ Retention information.

_____ Frequency with which students make use of faculty office hours.

_____ Diversity of students who show up for office hour opportunities.

_____ Instructor attitudes of student learning.

_____ Appreciation/awareness of learning modalities as measured by classroom assessment and inclusion of modalities in lesson plans.

_____ Percentage of students that instructor likes.

#8 COMMUNITY PERCEPTION OF THE COLLEGE

_____ Number of students attending who were referred by a former student or employee.

_____ Amount and quality of favorable newspaper media coverage.

_____ Solicited community attitudes using various methods (surveys, telephone contacts, focused interviews) of various groups such as employers, high school counselors, underrepresented populations. Formal needs assessment, including perceived attitudes, is the most comprehensive method.

_____ Percentage of local high school graduates attending college.

_____ Participation rate of population of the District in college activities.

_____ Number of requests for service from business, industry and other agencies.

#9 — ADEQUATE FACILITIES TO SUPPORT COLLEGE PROGRAMS

_____ Number of square feet in permanent vs. temporary facilities

_____ Dollars spent on maintenance per ASF.

_____ Dollar amount of emergency replacement of facilities.

_____ Amount of non-instructional space able to be scheduled for other activities.

_____ Ratio of instructional to non-instructional space.

_____ ASF/WSCH by discipline area.

_____ Number of hours of room availability compared to number of hours used.

_____ Proportion of seats filled when in use.

_____ Adequate mix of classroom sizes from Seminar to Lecture Hall.

_____ Flexibility/Adaptability of floor space to meet changing needs.

_____ Adequacy of equipment to meet current instructional needs.

#10 RETENTION OF STUDENTS

(Note: Each of the measures listed below is to be cross-tabulated with various student variables, e.g.: by basic skill level or by student goal.)

_____ Total units completed divided by total units attempted at 1st census (unit earned rate).

_____ Re-enrollment rates (over time).

_____ Changes in re-enrollments over time within the institution.

_____ Changes in unit earned rate over time within the institution.

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

OFFICERS:

Patricia G. Siever, District Academic Senate President, Los Angeles Community College District, President
Roberta Mason, Member, Board of Trustees, Lake Tahoe Community College District, Vice-President
Lois A. Callahan, President, College of San Mateo, Past President

DIRECTORS:

Linda Allen, Student Trustee, Compton Community College District
Peter Blomerley, President and Superintendent, Fremont-Newark Community College District
Barbara Davis, Professor, Social Science Division, Sacramento City College
John Feare, Professor of Counseling, Grossmont College
Hilary Hsu, Chancellor and Superintendent, San Francisco Community College District
Melvina Jones, Professor of European History, Antelope Valley College
Diana Lockard, Member, Board of Trustees, Citrus Community College District
David Lopez-Lee, Member, Board of Trustees, Los Angeles Community College District
Peter MacDougall, President and Superintendent, Santa Barbara Community College District
Mary Reynaga, Student Trustee, Palomar Community College District
Herbert Sussman, President and Superintendent, Rio Hondo Community College District

STAFF:

Peter M. Hirsch, Executive Director
Cindra J. Smith, Associate Executive Director
Walter C. Rilliet, Commissioner of Athletics
Rita Mize, Director of Governmental Affairs
Jennifer Robertson, Director of Public Information Services
Ron Richardson, Administrative Assistant to the Commissioner of Athletics
Denise Henrikson, Manager of Fiscal Services
Martha E. Mathias, Secretary to the Executive Director and to the Board of Directors
Debra A. Stephen, Secretary to the Commissioner of Athletics
Kim Meister, Secretary to the Associate Executive Director
Martha Christiansen, Secretary
Leslie Leder, Receptionist/Secretary

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
JAN 2 0 1989